

REMARKS

Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 15-35 are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicants' representative on July 14, 2008. Claim 15 and the Brown patent were discussed during the interview. The substance of the interview is reflected by the following comments.

Claims 15-21 and 25-35 were rejected 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (US 6,868,358); Claims 22 and 23 were rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Brown in view of Lin et al. (US 2002/0024432); and Claim 24 was rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Brown in view of Boesch (US 6,118,369). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as set forth below.

Applicants submit that the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 15. In particular, Brown does not disclose the feature of claim 15 that "when the difference between the determined tire pressure value and the stored nominal value exceeds a predetermined threshold value, the stored nominal value is replaced by a new nominal value, with the determined tire pressure value being used to determine the new nominal value."

Brown discloses measuring a gauge pressure, correcting the gauge pressure to compensate for load, temperature and environmental pressure to a filtered pressure value, and comparing the filtered pressure value to a pressure

warning threshold. *See, e.g., col. 3, lines 28-53 and col. 7, lines 40-48.* Thus, Brown's method is based on a comparison between the filtered pressure value and the pressure warning threshold. If the filtered pressure value is outside of the pressure warning threshold, then a warning signal is output to indicate a cautionary or unacceptable condition of the filtered pressure value. *See, e.g., col. 3, lines 39-46 and col. 7, line 52 – col. 8, line 5.*

In other words, Brown determines a filtered pressure value by taking into account the temperature, uses the determined filtered pressure value to determine whether an appropriate tire pressure exists by comparing the filtered pressure value to the pressure warning threshold, and based on the comparison activates an alarm (e.g., warning light) if the filtered pressure value is outside of the pressure warning threshold. The reference determines whether the filtered pressure value itself (not a difference from this value) exceeds the pressure warning threshold. Brown does not determine whether a difference between a determined tire pressure value and a stored nominal value exceeds a predetermined threshold value, and thus it does not determine whether such a difference exceeds a predetermined threshold value.

Additionally, although Brown discloses activating an alarm if the pressure warning threshold is exceeded, it fails to disclose that a stored nominal value is replaced by a new nominal value. The Office Action refers in this regard to Brown's disclosure of providing a reliable value to compare against the tire inflation warning condition in col. 7, lines 39-47. This excerpt, however, does not

correspond to replacing a stored nominal value by a new nominal value. Rather, the cited disclosure simply indicates that the filtered pressure value is used to compare to the pressure warning threshold. Brown does not teach or even suggest replacing the filtered pressure value by the pressure threshold value against which it is compared.

Therefore, Brown fails to disclose the feature of claim 15 of “wherein, when the difference between the determined tire pressure value and the stored nominal value exceeds a predetermined threshold value, the stored nominal value is replaced by a new nominal value, with the determined tire pressure value being used to determine the new nominal value.” In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 15 is patentable over Brown.

Moreover, if the Office Action is associating Brown’s gauge pressure as the tire pressure indicative of a tire filing pressure, then Brown cannot disclose the step of claim 15 of comparing the determined tire pressure value with a stored nominal value. This is the case, because it is the filtered tire pressure, not the gauge pressure that is compared to the threshold value. *See, e.g., col. 7, lines 45-48.* Further, there is no determination of the difference between the gauge pressure and the threshold value. Therefore, even under this alternate interpretation of Brown’s disclosure, the reference fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 15.

Claims 16-21 and 25-34 are patentable due to their dependence from claim 15.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 35 distinguishes over the cited references for the same reasons noted above. Moreover, Brown does not disclose or suggest a determination of whether the temporal course of a change in air pressure follows a pattern that is indicative of a filling of the tire by an operator. Instead, Brown detects a pressure value and adjusts the detected pressure value based on the load, temperature, and environmental pressure. The adjusted pressure value (i.e., filtered pressure value) is compared to a pressure threshold value, and a warning is output if the filtered pressure value is outside of the pressure threshold value. The filtered pressure value is not replaced by the pressure threshold value against which it is compared.

Applicants submit that claims 22-24 are patentable over the prior art due to their dependence from claim 15 and because the Lin and Boesch references fail to make up for the above-described deficiencies of Brown.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and

please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit
Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 095309.57883US).

July 16, 2008

CROWELL & MORING, LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
GRE:CWB:crr
5743561

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Cameron W. Beddard", is written over a horizontal line.

Gary R. Edwards
Registration No. 31,824
Cameron W. Beddard
Registration No. 46,545